

LARGE GROUP EXERCISE NOTES - CAC

Butte County General Plan 2030 Goals and Policies Development (Meeting Series #5-2a) October 2, 2008

Urban Growth Boundaries and Community Separators

Question 1: Should the County implement additional urban growth boundaries, and if so, how?

- ◆ New policy: “Engage unincorporated communities who want to do so, in a community planning process, as resources are available, to set a community vision, with the possibility of developing urban growth boundaries as part of that process.”
- ◆ New policy: “Work cooperatively with municipalities to establish urban growth boundaries and revenue sharing.”
- ◆ Votes: *15 support, 1 oppose (2 abstain)*

Question 2: Should Gridley and Biggs have a community separator between them?

- ◆ No comment on this topic; let cities workout through resolution to Question 1.
- ◆ Votes: *Unanimous support*

Question 3: How should the public be involved in setting urban growth boundaries?

- ◆ Replace policies A, B and C with the following: “Do not change the exiting process to establish urban growth boundaries. However, it should be noted that the public must be involved in that process.”
- ◆ Votes: *Unanimous support*

Question 4: What modifications, if any, should be made to the Chico Area Greenline, which establishes a boundary between urban and agricultural uses in the area west of Chico?

- ◆ If, after Ag policy discussion, we need to, we can discuss this question next week.

Question 5: How should the County protect the Neal Road Landfill?

- ◆ Establish a compatibility zone of appropriate width around landfill that allows uses that are compatible, such as ag, light industrial and sewage treatment plants.
- ◆ Votes: *18 support, 1 oppose (0 abstain)*

County Character, New Development and Housing

Question 6: How should the County improve the design and architectural quality of new development?

- ◆ No design/architecture regulations.
- ◆ Policy to encourage development compatible with ridgelines.
- ◆ Votes: *15 support, 0 oppose (1 abstain)*

Question 7: How should the County work to provide more affordable housing? (For the purposes of the General Plan, “affordable housing” is defined as housing that is affordable for “very-low” and “low” income households, which are households that earn no more than 50% and 80% of the County’s median income, respectively. “Affordable housing” does not cost more than 30 percent of a household’s income.)

- ◆ Policies B, D, E, F, G and H
 - Votes: *15 support, 1 oppose (0 abstain)*
- ◆ The CAC voted on the following three policy options regarding inclusionary zoning:
 - Policy I (no inclusionary zoning): *6 support*
 - Policy A, with policy C deleted (inclusionary zoning, without option for in-lieu fee): *0 support*
 - Policy A and C (inclusionary zoning with in-lieu fee option): *9 support*
- ◆ Action Item to develop ordinance re: inclusionary policies with in-lieu fee option.

Regional and Local Coordination

Question 8: How should the County more effectively coordinate its planning efforts with those of the five incorporated municipalities, other Counties and other planning and regulatory agencies?

- ◆ Modify Policy A: Change “annual” to “quarterly”
- ◆ Keep all other policies.
- ◆ Votes: *13 support, 0 oppose*

Question 9: How should the County work with local unincorporated communities in planning for their futures?

- ◆ Policies A through C.
- ◆ Votes: *Unanimous support*

Cultural Resources and Tribal Coordination

Question 37: How should the County respect Native American culture and planning concerns?

- ◆ The CAC voted on four motions. The first motion included the following:

- Policy B only, but list other policy options as possible items to include in memoranda.
- Votes: *15 support, 0 oppose (0 abstain)*
- ◆ The second motion included the following:
 - Policy E
 - Votes: *10 support, 2 oppose (3 abstain)*
- ◆ The third motion included the following:
 - New policy: “Seek to protect significant archaeological and historical resources.”
 - Votes: *9 support, 1 oppose (3 abstain)*
- ◆ The fourth motion included the following:
 - New action item: “Conduct inventory of historical resources.”
 - Votes: *8 support, 4 oppose (1 abstain)*

Community Health and Safety

Question 38: How should the County address community health and safety?

- ◆ The CAC voted on two motions. The first motion included the following:
 - Policies B through H
 - Votes: *13 support, 0 oppose (0 abstain)*
- ◆ The second motion included the following:
 - Modify A: indicate that the health information should be available when making land use decision, but that there is no requirement to use it; and remove reference to fast-food restaurants.
 - Votes: *12 support, 1 oppose (1 abstain)*

Question 39: How should the County address youth services?

- ◆ Research option A to see what exists, and craft appropriate policy.
- ◆ Policies A through H, with understanding that we’ll do additional research to ensure they are consistent with existing policies, also modify option F to make the role more general to County planning efforts, not just bike safety.
- ◆ Votes: *13 support, 1 oppose (0 abstain)*

[Note: DC&E is coordinating with the Butte County Children & Families Commission to ensure that these policies are consistent with existing plans, based on the CAC’s direction. Updated information will be provided to the Planning Commission based on this coordination.]

Noise

Question 40: How should the County address noise issues?

- ◆ Policy A, with modification to only to establish a noise ordinance.
- ◆ Delete B.
- ◆ Votes: *10 support, 3 oppose (1 abstain)*